



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/374,408	08/13/1999	CHRISTOPHER C. ANDREWS	ANDREWS-0080	3712

28960 7590 03/26/2002
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

EXAMINER

FOSTER, ROLAND G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/374,408

Applicant(s)

ANDREWS, CHRISTOPHER C.

Examiner

Roland G. Foster

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

On page 6, paragraph 1 of the amendment, filed on Oct. 31, 2001 as Paper No. 11, the applicant states that "Bobo [U.S. Patent No. 5,675,507] does not teach that the messages are each stored and accessed at an independently accessible address" where the "messages are separately accessible using an independently accessible address."

Although the applicant's argument has been considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. Bobo teaches that the messages are each stored and accessed at a resource accessible using a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") address (col. 7, lines 25-38). The URL address is an independently accessible address because the address can be "accessed" by entering a URL into a browser running on any "independent" computer system connected to the World Wide Web ("WWW"). Further, the messages are separately accessible using the URL (independently accessible address) because the user "uses" the URL to access the appropriate web page (col. 7, lines 25-38). Once accessed, each message is separately accessible by using the anchors or links on the web page corresponding to the URL. (col. 12, line 63 - col. 13, line 23).

Art Unit: 2645

On page 6, paragraph 2 of the amendment, the applicant states that "Bobo does not teach that any notification is sent to the recording user responsible for leaving the message."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. Bobo has not been relied upon to reject this claimed feature.

On page 7, paragraph 3 of the amendment, the applicant states the "Bobo does not associate the URL with any of the individual messages."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. As discussed above, the URL (independently accessible address) is associated with a web page containing anchors and links to the messages. Therefore, the URL is associated with each message.

On page 8, paragraph 1 of the amendment, the applicant states that "[t]o access a message, the user in Bobo must first log into his or her mailbox" which contrasts to the instant invention where "anyone can review the message."

Art Unit: 2645

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim (e.g., the ability for anyone to read the message without having to log in first) are not read into the claim in order to narrow the scope of the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993), *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997), and *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989). See MPEP § 2106.II.C at 2100-9 and MPEP § 2111. Nonetheless, nothing prevents anyone from accessing the URL (independently accessible address) anywhere so long as they have the proper identification and password.

On page 8, paragraph 8 of the amendment, the applicant states that "the URL in Bobo is used to grant the user access to his or her mailbox as opposed to an individual message."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. As discussed above, the URL in Bobo grants the user access to individual messages

Art Unit: 2645

through the use of anchors and links on the web page corresponding to the URL.

On page 9, paragraph 3 of the amendment, the applicant states with respect to claim 17 that "Bobo does not teach that a recorded audio file is included within a second file, such that when the second file is accessed using the computer system, the recorded audio file is available for playback at the computer system."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. See col. 13, lines 5-15 where the recorded audio file (e.g., 1.wav) is logically included within the audio html file (e.g., the voicelist.html file) (second file) as an anchor or link such that when the voicelist.html (second file) is accessed using the computer system, the 1.wav file (recorded audio file) is available for playback. Note that the broad limitation of a first file being "within" a second file does not require that the every aspect of the first file is contained within the second file, especially in the case of files and operating systems. For example, the first file may appear to be within the second file at the user interface level of an operating system yet the first file (or

Art Unit: 2645

significant portions of the first file) are stored at an entirely different location on a disk (e.g., operating system file clustering).

On page 12, paragraph 1 of the amendment, the applicant remarks that

Uppaluru [U.S. Patent No. 5,915,001] does not disclose recording an audio communication thereby establishing a recorded audio file for playback over a computer system nor associating an independently accessible address with the recorded audio file, wherein the recorded audio file is separately accessible using the independently accessible address.

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. Uppaluru discloses recording an audio communication that is accessible using a URL (col. 21, lines 10-29) thereby establishing a recorded audio file for playback over a computer system (col. 7, lines 20-39). Because recorded audio file is accessible using a URL and because a URL is an independently accessible address (as discussed above), Uppaluru discloses that the recorded audio file is separately accessible using the independently accessible address. See also the title and abstract of Uppaluru.

Art Unit: 2645

On page 13, paragraph 2 of the amendment, the applicant states that "Uppaluru teaches that the voice web pages and information in the voice web pages are documents, rather than recorded audio files."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. See the title and abstract.

On page 14, paragraph 1 of the amendment ,the applicant states that "the present invention does not utilize a special voice browser or a voice web server to access the recorded audio files."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim (e.g., not utilizing a special voice browser nor voice web server) are not read into the claim in order to narrow the scope of the claims as discussed above. Nonetheless, see col. 7, lines 20-23 where the voice web pages "can be accessed by a conventional web browser using HTTP protocols from a conventional web server."

Art Unit: 2645

On page 14, paragraph 2 of the amendment, the applicant states that:

Uppaluru does not teach that the user is provided the address in which the use can access the linked voice web page by accessing the independently accessible address...[i]n other words, a user wanting to access a particular voice web page in Uppaluru must navigate thorough the voice web site by inputting voice commands or touch tone inputs to reach the intended voice web page."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. The voice web pages "can be accessed by a conventional web browser using HTTP protocols from a conventional web server" (col. 7, lines 20-23).

On page 18, paragraph 3 of the amendment, the applicant states that "[i]n Uppaluru, there is not hint, teaching or suggestion that a notification is sent to the recording user specifying the address associated with the recorded audio file."

Although the applicant's remarks have been duly considered, they are not deemed fully persuasive. Uppaluru teaches that the user may access the voice web pages using a "conventional" WWW browser (col. 7, lines 20-23). A conventional "browser" would have the capability to display the URL (address associated with

Art. Unit: 2645

the recorded audio file as discussed above) of any web pages that were sent to it. Uppaluru also teaches of a yellow page program sends voice web pages to a user's browser. It would have been obvious that the yellow page program would have sent the voice web page to the advertiser's (recording user's) conventional browser because the advertiser would want to visually review his or her advertisement in order to ensure that the advertisement was accurately published on the WWW. Therefore, sending the yellow voice web page to the recording user's browser would display (send notification of) the voice web page URL (address associated with the recorded audio file).

For the above reasons, the applicant's remarks are not deemed persuasive and the following rejections are repeated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another

Art Unit: 2645

who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-19, 21-43, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bobo, II (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,507) [Hereinafter Bobo], as used in the prior Office action.

With respect to claim 1, the following paragraphs for additional details on how Bobo anticipates particular limitations in the claim.

"[A]. establishing a telephony connection between a telephony device and a call recording device" reads on Figs. 1 and 2, where a telephone call (telephony connection) is established between Telephone Set 26 (telephony device) and a

Art Unit: 2645

call recording device (Message Storage and Delivery System) (MSDS 10).

"[B]. recording an audio communication transmitted over the telephony connection thereby establishing a recorded audio file" reads on Fig. 2, step 52 where the message is recorded and stored.

"[C]. associating an independently accessible address with the recorded audio file, such that when the address is accessed using the computer system, the recorded audio file is transmitted to the computer system for playback" reads on Fig. 1, Fig. 3, step 62, Fig. 8, and col. 7, lines 25-31 where the user enters a URL (address) at a Computer with a hypertext browser 32 (computer system) to access the MSDS 10. The URL (address) is "associated" with the recorded audio file in that the URL is associated with the MSDS 10 mailbox where the recorded audio file is stored. The audio file is converted into a format appropriate for HTML linking, such as AU or WAV and transmitted to Computer 32 (computer system). See also col. 12, line 63 - col. 13, line 23. The phrase "independently accessible address" is extremely broad. For example, the URL (address) associated with the recorded audio file is an address

Art. Unit: 2645

independently accessible by any computer browser connected to the WWW. "[W]herein the recorded audio file is separately accessible using the independently accessible address" reads on col. 18, lines 35-56 where the recorded audio file is accessible via the WWW at "virtually any location in the world". An URL (address) that is accessible via the WWW at virtually any location in the world can be considered a separately and independently accessible address. For example, an "independent" computer is capable of "separately" "accessing" the recorded audio file somewhere else on the WWW. Once accessed, each message is separately accessible by using the anchors or links on the web page corresponding to the URL. (col. 12, line 63 - col. 13, line 23).

Claim 17 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 17 recites the following limitation: "c. including the recorded audio file within a second file, such that when the second file is accessed using the computer system, the recorded audio file is available for playback at the computer system" This limitation reads on reads on col. 13, lines 5-15 where each audio html files (second file) includes an anchor to the actual audio file (i.e., 1.wav). Thus, the recorded audio file (e.g., 1.wav) is logically included within the audio html file (e.g.,

Art Unit: 2645

the voicelist.html file) (second file) as an anchor or link such that when the voicelist.html (second file) is accessed using the computer system, the 1.wav file (recorded audio file) is available for playback. Note that the broad limitation of a first file being "within" a second file does not require that the every aspect of the first file is contained within the second file, especially in the case of files, programs, and operating systems. For example, the first file may appear to be within the second file at the user interface level of an operating system or program yet the first file (or significant portions of the first file) are stored in an entirely different location on a disk (e.g., operating system file clustering).

Claim 22 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 22 recites the means to perform the method steps of claim 1. Therefore, see the claim 1 rejection for any additional details. In addition, "a. means for establishing a telephone connection..." reads on Fig. 1, Telephone Set 26. "[B]. Means for recording..." and "c. means for storing..." reads on Fig. 1, MSDS (10).

Claim 30 differs substantively from claim 22 in that claim 30 recites a "circuit" and "systems" to instead of "means" as in

Art Unit: 2645

claim 22. However, the "circuit" and "systems" reads on the "means" of claim 22. Therefore, the claim 22 rejection for any further details.

Claim 37 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 37 recites a "server" and "systems" to perform the method steps of claim 1. . Therefore, see the claim 1 rejection for any additional details. "[A]. a call processing and recording system" reads on Fig. 13, Central Processor (3). "[B]. a server coupled to the call processing and recording system" reads on Fig. 13, Internet Server 5. Note that Fig. 13 illustrates the various systems that comprise MSDS 10. See also col. 16, lines 47 - 67. "[c]. one or more computer systems" reads on Fig. 1, Computer 32.

Claim 48 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 48 recites that the file is played back to "each of one or more receiving users who access the address." This limitation reads upon Bobo where the message is played back to each of the one or more use who logs into the mailbox with the appropriate ID and password.

Art. Unit: 2645

With respect to claim 2, see Fig. 13, Internet Server 5 and col. 17, lines 37-43.

With respect to claim 3, see Fig. 8 and col. 12, line 63 - col. 13, line 23. Note that the address (URL) is accessed when the audio file is retrieved.

With respect to claims 4, 28, and 42, see col. 13, lines 10-15 where the user selects an anchor (hyperlink) to access a voice message (audio file). Although the anchor (hyperlink) may be a simple HREF command referring to the voice message (audio file), selecting the hyperlink would still result in the html address (URL) corresponding to user's mailbox on the Internet Server 5 being sent to Internet Server 5 in order for the browser to request and retrieve the voice message (audio file) from Internet Server 5.

With respect to claims 5, 25, 26, 33, and 34, see Fig. 1 where an Internet (data) connection is established between the Computer 32 and the MSDS 10 in order to play back recorded audio (col. 12, line 63 - col. 13, line 33).

Art Unit: 2645

With respect to claims 6, 29, 36, and 43, see col. 13, lines 10-15 and the claim 4 rejection above.

With respect to claims 7, 19, 24, 32, and 39, see Fig. 13 where the Internet Server 5 (server) is remote from the Computer 32 (computing system).

With respect to claim 9, the message storage process of Fig. 2 and message retrieval process of Fig. 3 are separated by time. The phrase "recorded audio file is first available for playback" is a broad term. For example, an audio file may be only considered "available" to the user when the user has established an Internet connection and successfully logged onto the MSDS 10 by entering a correct logon id and password. If the user is unable to log onto the MSDS 10, then the audio files are "unavailable" to the user.

With respect to claim 10, the user inherently has the ability to specify the "time" by simply deciding when to attempt to log onto the MSDS 10 (see the claim 9 rejection above) and review messages, such as immediately after the recording was made or after a lengthy delay period.

Art Unit: 2645

With respect to claim 11, a "location profile" is a broad enough phrase to correspond to the time zone that the MSDS 10 resides in because the time zone is a significant feature that helps to "profile" the location of MSDS 10. The time zone that the MSDS 10 is located in would in turn determine the "time" when remote users log onto the MSDS 10 from areas outside the time zone. As stated in the claim 10 rejection, the "time" that user logs onto the MSDS 10 specifies the range when the recorded audio file is first available for playback.

With respect to claim 13, see col. 8, lines 10-20 and col. 13, lines 16-18.

With respect to claim 14, the link is posted in a predetermined location, namely in the MSDS 10.

With respect to claim 15, see col. 13, lines 13-14.

With respect to claim 18, the web server would serve the html file and anchored audio file (step of including is performed by a server).

Art Unit: 2645

With respect to claims 23, 31, and 38, see Fig. 15, Storage (11).

With respect to claim 27, see Fig. 13, Internet Server (5).

With respect to claim 35, see Fig. 15, Storage (11) where the html files are addressed via the Internet (30).

With respect to claim 40, see col. 6, lines 20-22.

With respect to claim 41, see Fig. 1.

Claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 22, 30, 37 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uppaluru (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,001), as used in the prior Office action. Uppaluru teaches of a system for providing speech files that are accessible via the Internet. Significantly, Uppaluru also teaches of allowing users to make the speech files accessible (publishing the speech files) using a telephonic connection.

With respect to claim 1, the following paragraphs for additional details on how Uppaluru anticipates particular limitations in the claim.

Art Unit: 2645

"[A]. establishing a telephony connection between a telephony device and a call recording device" reads on col. 20, lines 4-10.

"[B]. recording an audio communication transmitted over the telephony connection thereby establishing a recorded audio file" reads on col. 21, lines 10-13.

"[C]. associating an independently accessible address with the recorded audio file, such that when the address is accessed using the computer system, the recorded audio file is transmitted to the computer system for playback" reads on col. 21, lines 25-29 where a URL (address) is associated with the recorded audio files. See also col. 7, lines 13-67. The URL can then be accessed telephonically (col. 7, lines 28-39) or via a WWW browser (col. 7, lines 20-21). The phrase "independently accessible address" is extremely broad. For example, the URL address of Uppaluru associated with the recorded audio file is an address independently accessible by any computer browser connected to the WWW. "[W]herein the recorded audio file is separately accessible using the independently accessible address" reads on col. 7, lines 20-23 where the recorded audio

Art Unit: 2645

file is accessible via the WWW at virtually any location in the world. An address that is accessible via the WWW at virtually any location in the world can be considered a separately and independently accessible address. For example, an independent computer is capable of "separately" "accessing" the recorded audio file somewhere else on the WWW.

Claim 17 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 1 recites the following limitation: "[C]. including the recorded audio file within a second file, such that when the second file is accessed using the computer system, the recorded audio file is available for playback at the computer system" reads on the embedding process of col. 7, lines 34-35.

Claim 22 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 22 recites the means to perform the method steps of claim 1. Therefore, see the claim 1 rejection for any additional details. In addition, "[A]. means for establishing a telephone connection" reads on Fig. 1, Telephone Set 111. "[B]. means for recording" reads on Fig. 1, Voice and Telephony Interface 114 and col. 6, lines 23-30. "[C]. means for storing" reads on Fig. 1, Voice Web Site 102.

Art Unit: 2645

Claim 30 differs substantively from claim 22 in that claim 30 recites a "circuit" and "systems" to instead of "means" as in claim 22. However, the "circuit" and "systems" reads on the "means" of claim 22. Therefore, the claim 22 rejection for any further details.

Claim 37 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 37 recites a "server" and "systems" to perform the method steps of claim 1. . Therefore, see the claim 1 rejection for any additional details. "a. a call processing and recording system..." reads on Fig. 1, Voice and Telephony Interface 114. "b. a server coupled to the call processing and recording system..." reads on Fig. 1, Voice Web Site 102.

Claim 48 differs substantively from claim 1 in that claim 48 recites that the file is played back to "each of one or more receiving users who access the address." This limitation reads upon Uppaluru where the message is played back to each of the one or more use who logs into the mailbox with the appropriate ID and password.

With respect to claims 8 and 20, see col. 1, lines 33-67.

Art Unit: 2645

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12 and 44-47, as they can best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru as applied to claims 1, 17, 22, 30 and 37 above.

Uppaluru fails to specifically disclose sending a notification to a recording user responsible for recording the audio communication where the notification specifies an independently accessible address associated with the recorded audio file.

However, Uppaluru teaches that the user who recently published a business yellow page (i.e., the advertiser) as discussed above in the claim 1 rejection may also access that page in the business yellow pages program (col. 20, lines 35-

Art-Unit: 2645

67). Note that the user may also browse voice web pages using a "conventional" WWW browser (col. 7, lines 20-23). Conventional WWW browsers have the inherent ability to display the URL of the page sent to them for display. Therefore, when the user searches for a voice web page in the yellow pages program (for example by entering the name of the business), the yellow page program responds by sending the corresponding voice web page for that business name to the user's browser which displays (sends notification of) the voice web page URL (independently accessible address associated with the recorded audio file as discussed above).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to send notification to the recording user (advertiser) that specifies the address as discussed above and as taught by Uppaluru to the yellow page publishing system of Uppaluru.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to increase yellow page accuracy and effectiveness by allowing advertisers to visually review and check how their yellow pages appear on the WWW by using a conventional WWW browser.

Art Unit: 2645

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

• Art-Unit: 2645

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roland Foster whose telephone number is (703) 305-1491. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan S. Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to customer service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600



r.g.f. R.S.F.
March 22, 2002